

FEB 06 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Li Fung Chang et al.**Serial No:** 10/791,945**Filing Date:** March 3, 2004**Title:** INCREMENTAL REDUNDANCY SUPPORT IN A CELLULAR
WIRELESS TERMINAL HAVING IR PROCESSING MODULE**Examiner:** Juan A. Torres**Art Group:** 2631**Docket No:** BP3012

Date: 02/06/07

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.41(a)(1)

This Reply is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed January 5, 2007.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 06 2007

Table of Contents

A.	Status of the Claims	Page 3
B.	Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on Appeal.....	Page 4
C.	Argument.....	Page 5
C.	Conclusions.....	Page 6

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 06 2007

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-22, 24-26 and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Parolari (US 200400811248 A1).

Claims 8, 12, 23, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parolari in view of Ramesh (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,758 B2).

Claims 1, 12, 27, 16, and 31 are subject to a provisional type double patent rejection over co-pending applications 10/731,803 and 10/791,945. These rejections are not addressed in this Appeal Brief.

B. Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on Appeal

1. The rejection of claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-22, 24-26, and 28-31 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by Parolari (US 20040081248 A1).
2. The rejection of claims 8, 12, 23, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parolari in view of Ramesh (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,758 B2).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERC. Argument:

FEB 06 2007

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11, 16, 18-20, 22, 26, and 29 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by Pukkila (US 20010017904 A1).

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner has merely cut and pasted portions of the Final Office Action from which this Appeal is made. The Examiner has failed to even address, much less rebut the arguments presented in the Applicants' Corrected Appeal Brief. Applicants direct the Board to all portions of the Corrected Appeal Brief, including discussion made with regard to now withdrawn prior art rejections made based upon Pukkila (US 20010017904 A1). Such discussion is relevant when considering the still maintained prior art rejections.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-22, 24-26, and 28-31 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by Parolari (US 20040081248 A1).

Again, Applicants point out that the Examiner has failed to even address, much less rebut the arguments presented in the Applicants' Corrected Appeal Brief. Applicants direct the Board to all portions of the Corrected Appeal Brief, including discussion made with regard to now withdrawn prior art rejections made based upon Pukkila (US 20010017904 A1). Such discussion is relevant when considering the still maintained prior art rejections.

FEB 06 2007

6

D. Conclusions

For the above-provided reasons, the Appellants respectfully request that all of the rejections of the Final Office Action be overturned and that the claims in the present application be allowed to issue.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. No. 36,520/

Bruce E. Garlick
Registration No. 36,520
Phone: (512) 264-8816
Fax No. (512) 264-3735

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE FILING 37 C.F.R 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via Facsimile by transmitting the attached documents to (571) 273-8300 on February 6, 2007.

February 6, 2007/Bruce E. Garlick, 36,520/

Date

Signature